

Application No.: 10/065,183

Docket No.: JCLA7802

REMARKS**Present Status of the Application**

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding non-final Office Action mailed on April 5, 2005. The Office Action rejected claims 1-21 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Aufderheide et al. (US Patent No. 6,587,097) in view of Kinoshita et al. (US Patent No. 6,300,594) and Abileah (20030222857 A1).

Claims 1-21 remain pending of which claims 1, 10 and 12 have been amended and claims 20-21 have been cancelled to more explicitly and more clearly describe the claimed invention. It is believed that no new matter is added by way of these amendments made to the claims or specification or otherwise to the application. For at least the following reasons, Applicants respectfully submit claims 1-19 are in proper condition for allowance and reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Discussion of the claim rejection under 35 USC 103

The Office Action rejected claims 1-18 and 20-21 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aufderheide et al. (USP 6,587,097, Aufderheide hereinafter) in view of Kinoshita et al. (USP 6,300,594, hereinafter Kinoshita) and Abileah (US Patent Publication 20030222857).

Applicants respectfully disagree and would like to point out that the independent claims 1 and 10, as amended, are directed to a display device structure comprising at least at least the transparent substrate and the contact layer that are capable of resisting ultra-violet rays. On the other hand, Aufderheide NOT ONLY fails to mention the ultra-violet shielding function BUT

Application No.: 10/065,183

Docket No.: JCLA7802

ALSO substantially fails to recognize the problems of exposure of the display panel to ultra-violet rays that the present inventors propose to resolve by providing a touch panel with ultra-violet resisting capability. Contrary to the Office's assertion, Aufderheide does not teach the transparent substrate or the contact layer is able to shield against UV rays in col. 5, ln 51-57, col. 7, ln 22-26, col. 8 ln. 19-24, ln 36-65. Instead, Aufderheide simply teaches the flex and the stable may be made from an insulating material including UV cured acrylate and may be adapted to provide a variety of functional surface treatments including electromagnetic shield, electrostatic shield, EMI (electromagnetic interference) shield, ESD shield or EMP (electromagnetic pulse) shield. An UV cured material is a material that is cured by ways of ultra-violet rays, and is not necessary capable of shielding against UV rays. Although Abileah teaches the capacitive touch panels being constructed from glass panels that provide UV protection for components underlying the glass panels of the touch panel, Abileah fails to teach that both the transparent substrate and the contact layer are capable of resisting ultra-violet rays.

Therefore no combination of Aufderheide, Kinoshita and Abileah in a manner suggested by the Examiner can possibly teach, suggest disclose every features of the claimed invention. Thus, Aufderheide, Kinoshita and Abileah fail to teach each and every features of the proposed amended independent claims 1 and 10. Claims 2-8 and 11-18, which depend from Claims 1 and 10, directly or indirectly, are also patentable over Aufderheide, Kinoshita and Abileah, at least because of their dependency from an allowable base claim.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-18 patently define over Aufderheide, Kinoshita and Abileah, and therefore should be allowed. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the above rejections is respectfully requested.

Application No.: 10/065,183

Docket No.: JCLA7802

2. *The Office Action rejected claim 19 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aufderheide in view of Kinoshita and Abileah as applied to claims 1-9, 11-18 above and in further view of Wang et al. (US-6,300,594, hereinafter Kinoshita).*

Applicants respectfully disagree and would like to point out that even though the Examiner relied upon Wang to disclose a double-sided tap, still Wang cannot possibly cure the deficiencies of Aufderheide, Kinoshita and Abileah for at least the reason as substantially discussed above. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 19 also patentably define over Aufderheide, Kinoshita and Wang for at least the same reasons discussed above, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Application No.: 10/065,183

Docket No.: JCLA7802


CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that all the pending claims 1-19 of the present application patentably define over the prior art and are in proper condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Date: 7/1/2005

4 Venture, Suite 250
Irvine, CA 92618
Tel.: (949) 660-0761
Fax: (949)-660-0809

Respectfully submitted,
J.C. PATENTS


Jiawei Huang
Registration No. 43,330